

REMARKS

Claims 1-66 and 68 were presented for examination and claims 1-66 and 68 are rejected. Applicants submit that claims 1-66 and 68 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 56-64, 66 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Brezak et al.(US Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0018913) (“Brezak”) as evidenced by Ganesan (US Patent Number 5,557,678) (“Ganesan”). Claims 1, 23 and 45 are independent claims. Claims 2-6, 10-19 and 21 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 24-28 and 32-43 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 23. Claims 56-64, 66 and 68 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 45. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Brezak and Ganesan, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claimed invention.

Patentability of Independent Claims 1, 23 and 45 over Brezak and Ganesan

Independent claim 1 is directed toward a method and independent claims 23 and 45 are directed towards systems for authenticating a client to a content server. These independent claims recite a second ticket generated by a ticketing authority before a first ticket is validated, the second ticket being disabled from use and the ticket authority enabling the second ticket for

use upon validation of the first ticket. Brezak and Ganesan, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest these features of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Brezak fails to disclose generating the second ticket before the first ticket is validated. The Examiner cites Ganesan for this purpose. Ganesan describes pre-generation of session keys and storing them on a server (Ganesan, col. 8, lines 64-65) but fails to teach or suggest generating a first session key that is disabled and enabling the disabled first session key upon validation of a second session key. As with the tickets of Brezak, the generated session keys of Ganesan are not disabled for use and do not depend on the validation of another session key to be enabled for use. Thus, Brezak, in view of Ganesan fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because Brezak and Ganesan, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a second ticket generated by a ticketing authority before a first ticket is validated, the second ticket being disabled from use and the ticket authority enabling the second ticket for use upon validation of the first ticket, Applicants submit independent claims 1, 23 and 45 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-6, 10-19 and 21 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 24-28 and 32-43 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 23. Claims 56-64, 66 and 68 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 45. Thus, dependent claims 2-6, 10-19, 21, 24-28, 32-43, 56-64, 66 and 68 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 56-64, 66 and 68 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Patentability of Dependent Claims over Brezak and Litai

Dependent claims 7-9, 29-31 and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Brezak in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0233554 to Litai et al. (“Litai”). Claims 7-8 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 29-31 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 23. Claims 53-55 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 45. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Brezak and Litai, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claimed invention.

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 23 and 45 are patentable and in condition for allowance. As with Brezak and Ganesan, Litai fails to teach or suggest a second ticket generated by a ticketing authority before a first ticket is validated, the second ticket being disabled from use and the ticket authority enabling the second ticket for use upon validation of the first ticket. Therefore, Litai fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 7-9, 29-31 and 53-55 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiners rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: December 26, 2007

/Christopher J. McKenna/

Christopher J. McKenna
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 248-5000